

Brainstorming /Working Session

Re: Pro's and Con's of the proposed Dunstable Village 40B

Present: Judy Larter, Dave Johnson, Wes Goss, Karl Huber, Peter Georges, Marilyn Pike, Kathy Icenogle, Chief Downes, David Dacquino, Mary Dacquino, Judy Denham, Dan St. Jean, Frank O'Connell, David Kimpton, William Moeller, Alan Chaney, Max McCormack, Joseph Vlcek, Leah Basbanes, Susan Tully, Diane Glinka, Kevin Welch, Ted Gaudette, Susan Psaledakis

Comments were gathered under five categories. After “scrubbing” to eliminate duplication, participants were asked to identify their first, second and third priority concerns.

R = Red = first priority/significance

B = Blue = second priority/significance

G = Green = third priority/significance

Public Safety

1. Traffic concerns including entrance/exit to development on a curve, Emergency vehicle access and increase of entering traffic. (5 R, 2 B)
2. Traffic congestion accentuated by school buses at school opening and dismissal time
3. Poor pedestrian crosswalk area.
4. Fire Protection concerns including High Density development/ ring design with minimal area in front, back or between buildings for emergency vehicles, and availability of water supply for fire fighting. No plan or space on site for cistern, etc. (1R, 1B)
5. Community Center concept/ proposal difficult to implement due to inadequate parking and poor access for elderly/handicapped. (1R)
6. Emergency response time will be slowed down from both Police and Fire stations.
7. Emergency data indicates that 26% of town's emergency incidents take place within 1 mile of this site.
8. Designated Emergency shelters in center of town and negative impact in case of evacuation.
9. Development access/egress onto area most likely impacted by hazardous materials trucking.
10. Limits future ability to address current road design problems.

Public Health

1. Septic design is problematic 2R, 1B, 1G
2. Waste Disposal – can the site support the needed system? Will the footprint impact the natural flow? 1G
3. Storm-waters run off is problematic. Plan does not indicate how the developer plans to deal with this issue. 1G
4. Trash Disposal issues. No indication on plan of placement of dumpsters or estimate of needed size.

Design

1. Design does not fit into Historic character of Center.
2. Plan shows little effort to mirror existing architecture. 2B, 3 G
3. Negatively impacts adjacent property values. 1 R, 1 G.
4. Obstructs pleasant rural vista for all abutters. 1R

5. Poor design for buffer zone.
6. Plan for planting trees for screening is inadequate. 1B
7. Plans for use of Historic Home unrealistic and/or detrimental to community? 1B
8. Community Center unrealistic given parking and access issues; R.E. Office only viable if owner occupied.
9. Demolition permit has been requested leaving intent questionable.
10. Plan has no mention of plan for public water access need for improvements or distribution. 1G
11. Lack of recreation area for children.
12. Too dense for the designated area.
13. Zoning requires full basements for health and safety reasons. Slab will need additional waiver.
14. Walkways may provide advantage if usable.
15. Plan does not indicate presence of sprinkler system.
16. Siting of development in hollow is problematic for drainage, etc.
17. Ugly

Environment

1. Loss of open space. 1R
2. Is there wet land? Historically considered wet meadow. 1R
3. Concerns about storm waters. 3B
4. Endangered Species inventory needed. 1G
5. Concerns about air pollution for neighbors; air conditioners, increase in traffic, etc. 1G
6. Release of exhausts; air pollution.
7. Environmental perspective on impacts of water, police, schools, traffic, sewage.
8. Plan for snow removal? Plan appears to pile snow over septic system – acceptable?
9. Pest and pet control concerns.
10. Loss of Historical/rural environment.

Economic Impact

1. Impact to school system? 2R 2 B
2. Does it fit into Affordable Housing Plan? 1R
3. This proposal does not compliment Rural Nature of town as other business in center. 1R
4. Needs to prove that surface water drainage can be conducted within property so as not to impact neighbors. 1G
5. No indication that the developer is familiar with the state's desire for Low Impact Development. 1G
6. Diminishes value of Town Center Homes. 1G
7. Major impact to infrastructure beyond town planning: Salmon Brook Project and MUD and Growth Limitation By-Law.
8. What will the tax impact be?
9. Forces faster change in demographics.
10. Concerns about market needs...overload of housing within short time.
11. Concerns regarding the possible acceptance of existing building for town use and the possible economic impact of taking responsibility for that building.